REMARKS

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 4, and 7-9 have been amended. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7-9 are pending and under consideration.

No new matter is being presented, and approval of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS 1, 2, 8 AND 9 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY BODIN ET AL. (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,604,106 B1) IN VIEW OF LI ET AL. (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,591,266) AND FURTHER IN VIEW OF ISAAC ET AL.. (U.S. 2006/0012172)

The rejections of claims 1, 2, 8 and 9 are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

On page 6 of the Action, the Examiner notes that Bodin et al. (hereinafter "Bodin") and Li et al. (hereinafter "Li") fail to teach or suggest a contents information process portion making a storage portion store the entire or a part of contents of the Web page determined by the operation portion in accordance with the parameter designated by the user in connection with Web page identifying information for the Web page and user identifying information for the user, and therefore Isaac et al. (hereinafter "Isaac") is newly cited as disclosing this feature.

Independent claim 1, for example, is amended herein to further clarify that a designation reception portion receives, from an administrator, designation of Web page identifying information and user identifying information; and a contents information extraction portion extracts from the storage portion the entire or a part of contents corresponding to Web page identifying information and user identifying information both of which relate to the received designation.

Moreover, embodiments of the present invention are capable of transmitting the regenerated Web page to a terminal device of the administrator who designated the Web page identifying information for the Web page.

For example, as described on page 9, lines 7-18, and page 10, lines 12-27, of the present specification, in the contents information process portion, only a part where display contents are changed, depending on the result of a process by business logic, is stored together with information identifying a Web page and information identifying a user. Thereby, according to embodiments of the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, a Web page that was sent to a specific user is easily reproduced. In addition, even if a current Web page partly or entirely differs from the Web page that was sent to a specific user, it is possible to truly

reproduce the Web page as viewed by the specific user.

Consequently, an administrator can eliminate the inconvenience specified in the "Description of the Prior Art" of the present specification. As described therein, when operating a Web server for generating a Web page in accordance with a parameter designated by a user, an administrator of the Web server may be asked by a user about the Web page that was transmitted to the terminal device. For example, an administrator of the Web server may receive a question about a method for dealing with a failure that is reported to the Web server. A report of the failure may include, for example, that there was no document found containing the entered keyword or that an error message was displayed, though a keyword was inputted correctly. However, in most cases, the user who submits an inquiry does not remember correctly the Web page that was displayed by the terminal device. Therefore, the administrator can obtain only ambiguous information about the failure, so it is difficult to answer the user's inquiry properly.

Li, on the other hand, discusses a system for updating Web pages stored in cache based on modifications to data stored in a database. When a user makes a request for a dynamically created Web page, the Web server 38 converts the request into a new request 46, including the URL and other parameters that can be understood by the application server 40. Then, the application server 40 puts together the dynamically created Web page 48 in HTML. (See Li, column 3, lines 37-49).

Bodin discloses merely a server-side mechanism that accepts a client request to serve contents, and returns a response. (Column 3, lines 54-57). The cited portion of Bodin merely discloses that the primary objective of Bodin is to optimize storage of the server contents, and dynamically serve such content in response to the client request. (Column 1, lines 64-66).

Finally, newly-cited Isaac merely discusses generating personalized web pages with personalized information from an individual user. A host computer interprets the scripted address as a request for display of the web page modified to the parameters. ([0011]-[0013] of Isaac).

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the cited art. Independent claim 8 recites similar features to those described above for independent claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the prior art fails to teach or suggest the features of independent claims 1 and 8 described above. Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and, thus, it is further submitted that claims 1 and 2 patentably distinguish over the prior art.

REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS 4, 5 AND 7 FOR OBVIOUSNESS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER ISAAC IN VIEW OF CARLSON (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,697,849)

The rejections of claims 4, 5 and 7 are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Independent claims 4 and 7 recite similar features to independent claim 1, described above. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 4 and 7 patentably distinguish over the cited art for at least the reasons provided above. Further, Carlson is merely cited as disclosing a business logic unit determining the entire or a part of contents of a Web page in accordance with a parameter designated by a user and, thus, does not cure the deficiencies of Isaac, Bodin and Li described above.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 4 and 7 patentably distinguish over the prior art. Claim 5 depends from claim 4 and inherits the patentability thereof. Thus, it is further submitted that claim 5 patentably distinguishes over the prior art.

CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. Further, all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _May 22, 2007_   By: _Michael P. Stanley_

Michael P. Stanley
Registration No. 58,523

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501